

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **24 March 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-42. IDS references were missing. The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters not mentioned in the description. Claims 4-5, 18-19, and 32-33 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-3, 15-17, and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael (*High Performance Dynamic Lock-Free Hash Tables and List-Based Sets*, hereinafter "Michael") in view of applicants' disclosed prior art (hereinafter "ADPA"). Claims 4, 18, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael in view of ADPA and further in view of Rakity et al (USPN 5,671,446, hereinafter "Rakity"). Claims 5, 19 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael, in view of ADPA and Rakity and further in view of Schimmel (USPN 5,960,434, hereinafter "Schimmel"). Claims 6, 20 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael, in view of ADPA and further in view of Hills (USPN 6,654,773, hereinafter "Hills"). Claims 7, 21 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael, in view of ADPA and further in view of Blaker et al (USPub 2001/0042204, hereinafter "Blaker"). Claims 8-13, 22-27, and 36-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michael, in view of ADPA and further in view of Schimmel.

IDS references

IDS references were missing.

Applicant provides herewith a copy of the PTO-1449 submitted on 16 October 2003, a copy of a postcard stamped by OIPE on 20 October 2003 showing receipt of the PTO-1449 and 18 references, and copies of the missing references.

Objections to the drawings

The drawings were objected to because they include reference characters not mentioned in the description.

Applicant has amended paragraph [003] as described above to include reference characters 104, 106-108, 110, 112-114, and 116. These amendments find support in FIG. 1 of the instant application. Applicant has added paragraph [0010.5] to include reference characters 202, 204-208, and 210-216. These amendments find support in FIG. 2A of the instant application. Applicant has amended paragraph [0045] to include reference characters 225-227, 229, 230, 232-233, 235, and 237. These amendments find support in FIG. 2C of the instant application. Applicant has amended paragraph [0050] to include reference characters 302, 304, 306-308, 310, 312-314, and 316, and to point out the differences between FIGs. 3A and 3B. These amendments find support in FIGs. 3A and 3B, and in paragraphs [0073]-[0080] of the instant application. Applicant has amended paragraph [0078] to point out the differences between paragraphs 2A and 2B. These amendments find support in FIG. 2A of the instant application. Applicant has amended paragraphs [0071] and [0072] to include reference characters 904 and 1004, respectively. These amendments find support in FIG. 9 and FIG. 10, respectively.

Objections to the claims

Claims 4-5, 18-19, and 32-33 were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended claims 4, 18, and 32 to depend from claims 3, 17, and 31, respectively as suggested by the Examiner.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Dependent claims 12, 26, and 40 were rejected as being unpatentable over Michael, in view of ADPA, and further in view of Schimmel. Examiner avers that Schimmel teaches "...increasing the number of buckets in the bucket array

involves mapping the existing bucket array into the top half of the larger bucket array.” Applicant respectfully points out that Schimmel **adds a pointer to the new buckets that point to the old buckets**, and then rehashing the data records over time (see Schimmel, col. 7, lines 56-64).

In contrast, the present invention **directly maps the old buckets into the top half of the new bucket array** (see FIG. 2C and paragraphs [0043]-[0046] of the instant application). This is beneficial because it does not require the subsequent rehashing of the data records. There is nothing within Michael, ADPA, or Schimmel, either separately or in concert, which suggests directly mapping the old buckets into the top half of the new bucket array.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, and 29 to include the limitations of claims 12, 26, and 40, respectively to clarify that the present invention directly maps the old buckets into the top half of the new bucket array. These amendments find support in FIG. 2C and in paragraphs [0043]-[0046] of the instant application. Dependent claims 8, 12, 22, 26, 36, and 40 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 9-10, 13, 23-24, 27, 37-38, and 41 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 15, and 29 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, 9-11, and 13-14, which depend upon claim 1, claims 16-21, 23-25, and 27-28, which depend upon claim 15, and claims 30-35, 37-39, and 41-42, which depend upon claim 29, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 9 May 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com